

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 240517

61

ORIGIN AF-08

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 EA-09 NEA-10 IO-13 ISO-00 SIG-02 SSO-00

NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INR-07 NSAE-00

PA-02 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 NSC-05 /087 R

DRAFTED BY AF/P:GGAY:MR

APPROVED BY AF/P:GGAY

S/PRS:FBROWN (INFO)

----- 023482

O P 280130Z SEP 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO ALL AFRICAN DIPLOMATIC POSTS IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY TOKYO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY PARIS IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION USUN NEW YORK PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY ALGIERS PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY RABAT PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY TUNIS PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 240517

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR, XJ

SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER 27 PRESS BRIEFING

FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS FROM SPOKESMAN ROBERT FUNSETH'S
SEPTEMBER 27 PRESS BRIEFING IN WHICH UNDERSECRETARY
WILLIAM D. ROGERS ALSO PARTICIPATED:

NOW I THOUGHT WE WOULD START THE BRIEFING ON THE SUB-
JECT OF RHODESIA, AND I HAVE ASKED UNDER SECRETARY ROGERS
WHO WAS A MEMBER OF THAT DELEGATION, TO ANSWER YOUR QUES-
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 240517

TIONS ON THAT SUBJECT.

SO, BILL, WOULD YOU LIKE TO START?

AND THEN WHEN WE HAVE COMPLETED THAT SUBJECT WE CAN GO ON TO THE OTHER POINTS.

Q: ON WHAT BASIS DO YOU HAVE THIS?

A: ON THE RECORD.

UNDER SECRETARY ROGERS

(RESPONSES BY THE UNDER SECRETARY)

MR. ROGERS: WE HAVE SEEN SOME STORIES OVER THE WEEK-END AND I THINK I WANT TO LAY OUT ON THE TABLE THE PROPOSITION THAT A LOT OF THESE HAVE BEEN BASED ON TOTAL MIS-UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT CAME OUT OF LUSAKA IN THE LAST COUPLE OF DAYS.

IN THE FIRST INSTANCE I WANT TO STRESS TO YOU THAT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS DID NOT REJECT THE PROPOSALS SET FORTH IN THE SMITH STATEMENT. THEY ACCEPTED THE ESSENCE OF THAT PROPOSAL.

THE BASIC SEQUENCE:

ONE, THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF MAJORITY RULE WITHIN TWO YEARS.

TWO, NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE FORMATION OF AN INTERIM GOVERNMENT, AND A MEETING FOR THAT PURPOSE.

THREE, NEGOTIATIONS ON HOW TO ARRANGE THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE.

SECONDLY: ON TOP OF THE STATEMENT WHICH YOU ALL HAVE SEEN FROM LUSAKA, WE HAVE HEARD FROM THE PRESIDENTS WHO ATTENDED IT.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 240517

Q: ALL FIVE?

A: NO.

Q: EACH HAS EXPRESSED HIS GRATITUDE FOR THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THIS RESPECT; AND THEY ALL HAVE STRESSED THAT THE MATTER IS ON TRACK.

Q: WERE THESE MESSAGES OVERNIGHT? WAS IT THIS MORNING
YOU HEARD FROM THEM?

A: BOTH YESTERDAY AND TODAY.

Q: DOES THAT INCLUDE NETO?

A: I DO NOT THINK I WANT TO SPECIFY EXACTLY WHICH ONES.

Q: WERE THEY SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF ALL OF THEM?

A: YES.

Q: AND YOU HAVE GOT ONE MESSAGE --

A: AND GIVING US THE SENSE OF THE MEETING AS THEY SAW IT.

Q: CAN YOU TELL US HOW MANY?

A: LET ME FINISH THE STATEMENT AND THEN WE WILL GET INTO
SOME QUESTIONS.

IN FACT, ONE LEADING PRESIDENT PRESENT AT THE CON-
FERENCE, STRESSED TO US -- AND THESE ARE BASICALLY HIS
WORDS -- THAT WE HAVE NOT REJECTED THE PROPOSAL AND WE
ARE PLEASED THAT YOU DID NOT REJECT THE LUSAKA STATEMENT.

THEY ALL INDICATED THAT THEY DID WANT TO DISCUSS THE
DETAILS OF THE TRANSITION GOVERNMENT AT THE FORTHCOMING
CONFERENCE. BUT THEY SAID: THEY COME TO THAT CONFERENCE
WITH NO PRECONDITIONS.

I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO GET ONE OTHER THING
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 240517

STRAIGHT: THE FIVE POINTS THAT SMITH SET FORTH IN HIS
STATEMENT WERE NOT "HIS" POINTS. THEY WERE PROPOSALS THAT
WE HAD PUT TO HIM.

FURTHERMORE, AFTER WE SAW SMITH WE HAD THE CHANCE TO
GO OVER THOSE PROPOSALS WITH THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS THAT
WE SAW.

FINALLY, I MIGHT SAY SOMETHING ABOUT THE SOVIET
ATTACK ON THE EFFORT:

THE SOVIETS HAVE SAID -- WHAT THE SOVIETS HAVE SAID
IS, ESSENTIALLY, IN OUR JUDGMENT, MISCHIEVOUS -- REFLECTING
THE NOTION THAT THEIR SELFISH INTEREST MIGHT BE SERVED BY
KEEPING THE TURMOIL GOING.

I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THE FACT THAT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS HAVE NOT FOLLOWED THE SOVIET POSITION ON THIS MATTER.

Q: NONE OF THEM?

A: NONE OF THEM -- EVEN THOUGH IT IS OBVIOUS THAT, AT LEAST ONE OF THE PRESIDENTS WHO WAS THERE HAS STRONG FOREIGN INFLUENCES IN HIS COUNTRY.

Q: STRONG WHAT?

A: FOREIGN INFLUENCES.

Q: CAN YOU PLEASE CLARIFY THAT? YOU ARE SAYING THAT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS DID NOT FOLLOW THE SOVIET POSITION, EVEN THOUGH ONE OF THEM DOES NOT HAVE STRONG FOREIGN INFLUENCES? ARE YOU TRYING TO --

A: NO, I SAID, "DOES HAVE."

Q: OH, "DOES HAVE."

A: YES.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 240517

Q: ARE YOU TRYING TO SAY THAT THIS PRESIDENT ALSO DID NOT FOLLOW THE SOVIET POSITION?

A: THAT IS RIGHT. THE LUSAKA STATEMENT WHICH, AS I SAY, IS A STATEMENT WHICH ACCEPTS THE ESSENCE OF THE PROPOSAL.

Q: BILL, COULD YOU CLEAR UP --

A: IT IS NOT AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL THAT IT BE REJECTED.

Q: WHY CAN'T YOU SAY THAT THAT IS ANGOLA?

Q: DO YOU WANT TO ANSWER THAT?

A: YES, I WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE IT THE WAY IT IS.

Q: CAN YOU CLEAR UP: IF YOU RECEIVED ONE MESSAGE ON BEHALF OF ALL THE PRESIDENTS WHO ATTENDED THE CONFERENCE -- OR DID YOU RECEIVE INDIVIDUAL MESSAGES FROM ONE OR MORE OF THE PRESIDENTS?

A: WE RECEIVED INDIVIDUAL MESSAGES FROM SEVERAL OF THE PRESIDENTS AND WHAT I HAVE TOLD YOU ABOUT THOSE MESSAGES, IS CONSISTENT FOR ALL OF THOSE THAT WE RECEIVED.

Q: YES, BUT NOW WAIT A MINUTE -- DOES THAT NECESSARILY INCLUDE THE VIEWS OF MOZAMBIQUE AND ANGOLA?

A: YES. THEY WERE SPEAKING AS TO THE GENERAL TONE, ATTITUDE, AT THE CONFERENCE -- AND THE WAY THE STATEMENT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD.

Q: CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

A: WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

Q: YES.

A: WHAT HAPPENS NEXT IS THE ORGANIZING OF THE CONFERENCE TO SETTLE THE DETAILS FOR THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 240517

Q: WHO ORGANIZES THAT?

A: PRESUMABLY, THE BRITISH. THE BRITISH WILL BE GOING OUT FOR THAT PURPOSE NOW.

TED ROWLANDS IS LEAVING LONDON. HE WILL BE GOING TO AFRICA TOMORROW, I THINK.

Q: TO ORGANIZE -- NOW THIS IS GOING TO ORGANIZE THE COUNCIL OF STATE --

A: NO, NO -- TO ORGANIZE THE MEETING WHICH WILL SETTLE THE TERMS, STRUCTURE, PROCESSES OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

Q: AND WHERE WILL THAT TAKE PLACE?

A: IT HASN'T BEEN SETTLED YET -- BUT ANYTHING IS OPEN, AS FAR AS --

Q: TO CLARIFY THAT -- THAT IS NOT THE SAME AS THE EXPLANATION THAT SMITH GAVE? THIS COULD BE A DIFFERENT ARRANGEMENT FROM THE ONE SMITH OUTLINED IN HIS SPEECH?

A: NO, IN THAT RESPECT, THERE IS NO DISPUTE.

THERE WILL BE A MEETING REPRESENTING BOTH SIDES -- THE AFRICANS AND THE EUROPEANS -- WHICH WILL SETTLE THE DETAILS THROUGH NEGOTIATION OF THE STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

Q: WHAT I AM SAYING IS: SMITH OUTLINED THOSE DETAILS -- THE COUNCIL OF STATE EVENLY DIVIDED BETWEEN THE BLACKS AND THE WHITES. ARE THOSE THE DETAILS YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT? HAVE THEY BEEN SETTLED IN ADVANCE?

A: ALL OF THE DETAILS WILL BE SETTLED AT THAT ORGANIZING CONFERENCE.

Q: THE QUESTION I AM ASKING: ARE THE DETAILS THAT SMITH UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 240517

GAVE, THE DETAILS THAT ARE IN PLAY?

A: IF I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION, THE ANSWER IS: YES.

Q: IN OTHER WORDS, ARE THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS ACCEPTING THE FORMULA AS RELAYED TO SMITH, AS SMITH PUBLICIZED IT -- NAMELY -- A COUNCIL OF STATE COMPOSED 50/50 WITH A WHITE CHAIRMAN, AND HIS DESCRIPTION OF A COUNCIL OF MINISTERS -- ARE THOSE THE TERMS THAT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS NOW SAY, IN AMPLIFICATION OF THEIR LUSAKA STATEMENT THAT THEY ARE NOW ACCEPTING?

OR, IS THE CONFERENCE GOING TO EXAMINE WHETHER OR NOT THEY WILL ACCEPT THOSE TERMS, BILL?

A: THE CONFERENCE IS GOING TO CLEARLY SETTLE THE QUESTION OF THE DETAILED PROCESSES AND STRUCTURE OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Q: WHERE DO THOSE TERMS COME FROM ORIGINALLY, THEN, "THE COUNCIL OF STATE" AND "THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS?" TERMS THAT --

A: THEY WERE THE PROPOSALS THAT WE PUT TO SMITH.

Q: YES, BUT DID YOU GET THEM --

Q: LET ME CLARIFY THIS. AREN'T YOU BACKING OFF A LITTLE BIT HERE IN TERMS OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND COUNCIL OF STATE -- AS WELL AS SUCH DETAILS AS "IT SHALL BE A WHITE SECURITY CHIEF" OR "LAW AND ORDER CHIEF"? AREN'T YOU NOW SAYING THAT ALL OF THAT IS NEGOTIABLE?

A: NO. WHAT WE ARE SAYING IS THAT THOSE ARE THE PROPOSALS THAT SMITH HAS PUT FORWARD. THE PROPOSALS THAT WE GAVE TO HIM. THEY ARE HIS POSITION WITH RESPECT TO HOW

THE GOVERNMENT OUGHT TO BE ORGANIZED.

THAT WILL BE HIS POSITION WHEN HE GOES(PRESUMABLY)

UNLESS HE CHANGES IT BEFORE THEN) THAT WILL BE HIS POSI-
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 240517

TION WHEN HE GOES TO THE ORGANIZING MEETING.

Q: BUT WHERE DID YOU GET THOSE PROPOSALS?

A: ON THE BASIS OF THE NEGOTIATED DISCUSSIONS THAT WE HAD
WITH THE --

Q: THEY ARE OURS?

Q: THEY ARE NOT NECESSARILY "OUR VIEW" OF WHAT SHOULD
COME OUT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. IS THAT CORRECT?

A: NO -- IN FINAL ANALYSIS -- IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, WE
WILL NOT IMPOSE ANY SOLUTION ON THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

IF THE PARTIES DIRECTLY INVOLVED FIND THAT SOME ALTER-
NATIVE OR SOME ADDITION TO THOSE SETS OF SUGGESTIONS,
COMMEND THEMSELVES TO BOTH SIDES, THEN THEY CAN OBVIOUSLY
ORGANIZE THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT IN THAT FASHION.

BUT THE IMPORTANT --

Q: NOW BILL, LET ME PUT THE QUESTION ONE MORE TIME. I
THINK THERE IS CONFUSION:

THE STATEMENT AS READ BY SMITH, HE SAID WAS GIVEN,
OR BASED ON THE PROPOSALS GIVEN TO HIM BY DR. KISSINGER.
THAT IS THE FIVE POINTS PLUS ONE.

WE WERE TOLD -- AND YOU REPEATED IT AGAIN TODAY --
THAT THOSE PROPOSALS WERE BASED UPON INTENSIVE CONSULTATION
WITH THE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS.

THEREFORE, WE WERE AT LEAST LED TO ASSUME, AND IN
FACT IT WAS CONFIRMED, I THINK, ON THE AIRPLANE, THAT ON
SPECIFIC POINTS SUCH AS THE FORMATION OF A COUNCIL OF
STATE, COUNCIL OF MINISTERS -- THESE HAD BEEN APPROVED IN
DETAIL BY AT LEAST THE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS THAT THE
SECRETARY HAD CONFERRED WITH.

THE STATEMENT YESTERDAY, WHILE NOT REJECTING THE
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 240517

SUBSTANCE OF THOSE PROPOSALS, NEVERTHELESS, LEFT THE IMPRESSION THAT EVERYTHING -- THAT NOTHING HAD BEEN SETTLED IN ANY WAY.

NOW ARE YOU SAYING THAT IN FACT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS HAVE AGREED TO THE FRAMEWORK AS OUTLINED BY SMITH? OR HAVE NOT AGREED?

Q: NO, WHAT I AM SAYING IS THAT THE ESSENCE OF THE PROCESS HAS BEEN AGREED TO BY THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS:

THAT THERE BE A MEETING AT WHICH THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, ITS STRUCTURE AND PROCESS, WILL BE SETTLED.

AND THAT BEYOND THAT, THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT WILL FUNCTION DURING THE PERIOD UP TO THE TIME WHEN THE MAJORITY RULE TAKES OVER -- WITHIN TWO YEARS.

Q: MR. ROGERS, THAT IS STILL NOT CLEAR. YOU HAVE NOT CLEARED UP THE BASIC PROBLEM. THE BASIC PROBLEM IS THAT SMITH OUTLINED THE STRUCTURE -- A COUNCIL OF STATE; A COUNCIL OF MINISTERS WITH THE VETO POWERS -- IS THAT WHAT THIS ORGANIZING CONFERENCE THAT THE BRITISH ARE NOW GOING TO PUT TOGETHER -- IS IT GOING TO PUT THAT STRUCTURE IN PLACE?

IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING?

OR IS THAT A BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS ONLY?

A: YOU MEAN THE PRECISE STRUCTURE THAT SMITH SETS FORTH IN PARAGRAPH 3?

Q: YES.

A: NO. OUR UNDERSTANDING FROM THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS IS THAT THEY WANT TO DISCUSS THE DETAILS PUT FORWARD BY SMITH.

Q: BUT YOU -

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 240517

A: THEY COME TO THE CONFERENCE WITH NO PRECONDITIONS. THEY ARE CONCERNED THAT THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT BE A GOVERNMENT WHICH CAN EFFECTIVELY FUNCTION AND PRODUCE EFFECTIVE

MAJORITY RULE AT THE END OF THE TWO YEARS PERIOD.

AND THAT IS WHAT THEY WANT TO FOCUS ON AT THE MEETING WHICH IS GOING TO ORGANIZE THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

Q: BUT YOU SAID THE SMITH PROPOSALS WERE U.S. PROPOSALS -- IS THAT RIGHT?

A: WHAT?

Q: SMITH'S PROPOSALS WERE, IN YOUR WORDS, "OUR" PROPOSALS THAT YOU HAD PUT TO SMITH.

A: WE PUT FIVE POINTS TO SMITH.

Q: NO, NO, NO, -- YOU KNOW, I'M TALKING ABOUT THE DETAILS OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT. YOU SAID THOSE WERE YOUR PROPOSALS TO HIM. IS THAT CORRECT?

A: YES.

Q: HAD THEY BEEN APPROVED BY THE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS?

A: NO. THEY AROSE OUT OF -- THEY AROSE OUT OF THE CONVERSATIONS WE HAD HAD WITH THE BRITISH, AT CONSIDERABLE LENGTH, AND THE DISCUSSIONS WE HAD WITH THE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS ON THE WAY TO PRETORIA.

Q: YES, MR. ROGERS -- RHODESIAN FOREIGN MINISTER VAN DER BYL IS QUOTED AS SAYING OF THESE AFRICAN LEADERS: "THEY HAVE AGREED TO IT." I PRESUME BY THAT, HE MEANS THE PROPOSAL.

"BUT IN TYPICAL AFRICAN NATIONALIST FASHION, THEY HAVE SHOWN THEIR TOTAL UNRELIABILITY AND UNWORTHINESS."

NOW MY QUESTION IS: IS MR. VAN DER BYL, IN THE SECRETARY'S VIEW, SIMPLY MISINFORMED, DELIBERATELY, PREVARI-
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 11 STATE 240517

CATING, OR IS HE TELLING THE TRUTH?

A: I DO NOT WANT TO COMMENT ON MR. VAN DER BYL'S COMMENTS AT ALL.

Q: HE SAID SEVERAL TIMES IN THAT SAME STATEMENT THAT AFRICAN LEADERS HAVE RENEGED ON WHAT HE SAID WAS AN UNDERSTANDING THAT THE TERMS OF THE GOVERNMENT TO BE ESTABLISHED, WOULD BE AS PRESENTED TO SMITH -- AND HE IS NOW, PRESUMABLY RENEGGING ON IT.

A: NO, WE DON'T CHARACTERIZE IT AS A RENEGGING . . .

Q: LET ME ASK: ARE YOU SATISFIED THAT THE FIVE FRONT LINE PRESIDENTS WILL ACCEPT MR. SMITH, OR ANY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESENT SALISBURY ADMINISTRATION IN THE COMING CONFERENCE?

A: THEY HAVE, NEITHER PUBLICLY NOR PRIVATELY, INDICATED THAT THEY WOULD REJECT SMITH AS A PARTICIPANT IN THAT CONFERENCE.

Q: WELL HAVE YOU HAD -- SINCE THIS THING YESTERDAY -- HAVE YOU HAD ANY CONTACT, THROUGH SOUTH AFRICA OR DIRECTLY, WITH THE SMITH GOVERNMENT?

A: NO.

Q: WELL CAN YOU SAY -- IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING NOW, THAT ON THE BASIS THAT YOU HAVE OUTLINED HERE, THAT THE SMITH GOVERNMENT IS PREPARED TO SEND REPRESENTATIVES TO A CONFERENCE TO NEGOTIATE OVER THE DETAILS OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT?

A: OBVIOUSLY, WHATEVER WOULD HAVE BEEN PUT DOWN IN THE PROPOSALS THAT SMITH ANNOUNCED, YOU CAN'T DESIGN AN INTERIM GOVERNMENT IN THE SHORT SPACE OF THE KIND OF STATEMENT THAT HE WAS MAKING.

THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN, UNDER THE BEST OF CIRCUMSTANCES, INEVITABLY, A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF DETAIL THAT HAD TO BE UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 12 STATE 240517

SETTLED BY THE PARTIES, THEMSELVES. IT HAS NOT ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE --

Q: BUT IT WAS NOT MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THOSE DETAILS WERE NEGOTIABLE. WE HAD BEEN LED TO BELIEVE, IF I UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY WHAT HAPPENED, THAT THERE HAD BEEN PRIOR AGREEMENT BY THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS TO THOSE DETAILS THAT WERE ANNOUNCED BY SMITH.

NOW WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT THOSE SIMPLY ARE SMITH'S NEGOTIATING POSITIONS --

A: NO, NO. LET ME GO OVER IT AGAIN:

WE DISCUSSED THE GENERALITY ON THE WAY DOWN TO PRETORIA. NOW THE GENERALITY OF:

FIRST, THE SET OF IDEAS ABOUT HOW THE PROCESS COULD WORK, WHICH WE DEVELOPED WITH THE BRITISH, AND WHICH WE HAD GONE OVER, IN GENERAL TERMS, WITH THE AFRICANS IN THE EARLIER MISSIONS.

WE THEN PRESENTED THOSE PROPOSALS. WE THEN PRESENTED SPECIFIC PROPOSALS, IN TERMS WHICH HAD BEEN DEVELOPED FROM THE CONVERSATIONS WE HAD HAD -- TO SMITH IN PRETORIA.

ON THE WAY BACK, WE SHARED WITH THE AFRICANS THAT WE SAW (KAUNDA AND NYERERE) THE SPECIFIC WORDS OF THE FIVE POINTS.

Q: BILL, CAN I GO BACK?

Q: YES, THAT'S PRECISELY THE POINT THAT WE NEED CLEARED UP:

WHEN YOU LEFT LUSAKA AND DAR -- THE SECOND TIME, ON THE WAY BACK -- WAS IT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PROPOSALS TO BE SET FORWARD BY SMITH IN HIS FRIDAY SPEECH WERE A BASIS FOR FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS?

Q: OR WERE THEY, AS WE HAVE BEEN LED TO BELIEVE, SPECI-
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 13 STATE 240517

FICALLY APPROVED BY THE BLACK PRESIDENTS?

NOW WHEN JOHN PUT THE QUESTION TO YOU BEFORE --

Q: ... YOU ARE BACKING AWAY VERY FAR FROM WHAT WE HAVE BEEN LED TO BELIEVE.

A: NO, I DON'T THINK WE EVER SAID TO YOU THAT THOSE TERMS HAD BEEN APPROVED PRIOR TO THE SMITH STATEMENT.

Q: YES, YOU HAVE.

Q: THEY WERE A NEGOTIATING BASIS ONLY -- THAT IS WHAT YOU ARE SAYING NOW.

A: NO. THEY WERE A BASIS -- THEY WERE WHAT SMITH WAS ADVANCING ON THE BASIS OF WHAT WE HAD PUT TO HIM AS HIS PROPOSAL FOR WHAT THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT SHOULD LOOK LIKE.

Q: WHEN HE LEFT LUSAKA AND DAR, IT WAS WITH THE UNDERSTANDING -- AND YOU ACCEPTED IT; YOU AND THE SECRETARY, AND THE REST OF THE PARTY ACCEPTED -- THAT THE TWO PRESIDENTS YOU SPOKE TO -- NYERERE AND KAUNDA -- WERE --

A: YES.

Q: -- ACCEPTING THESE MERELY AS A NEGOTIATING BASIS.

A: THEY WERE ACCEPTING THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS, THE IDEA OF AN ORGANIZING MEETING, TO SETTLE THE TOTALITY OF THE DETAILS WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

Q: BILL, LET ME SEE IF I CAN CLARIFY IT THIS WAY. IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS SHOULD DECIDE, ONE, THAT THEY WANT SOME DIFFERENT FORMAT THAN 50-50 IN A COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND A WHITE PRESIDENT; TWO, THEY WANT SOME DIFFERENT FORMAT THAN A TWO-THIRDS VOTE IN THE COUNCIL OF STATE, THREE, THAT THEY WANT SOME DIFFERENT FORMULA FOR THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS -- BY AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING, THEY ARE WITHIN THEIR RIGHTS TO RAISE QUESTIONS AS TO THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THE
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 14 STATE 240517

FORMULA.

A: OF COURSE,

Q: NOW, --

A: BECAUSE THE FINAL FORMULA OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, AS HAS BEEN CLEAR FROM THE BEGINNING, IS FOR THE PARTIES DIRECTLY INVOLVED TO SETTLE.

Q: ALL RIGHT, LET ME JUST FOLLOW THROUGH NOW.

A: WE ARE NOT IMPOSING ANY SOLUTION ON THE --

Q: I UNDERSTAND, BUT IS IT YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT SMITH BELIEVED THAT HE WAS ACCEPTING FIRM AGREEMENTS, AND THEREFORE THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD PROCEED FROM THOSE POINTS; NAMELY, THAT THE COUNCIL OF STATE WOULD BE 50-50 WITH THE WHITE CHAIRMAN, AND SO ON? DID HE UNDERSTAND THAT WHAT HE WAS SETTING FORTH WERE NOT THE ACTUAL FIRM DETAILS THAT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE BLACKS?

A: IF YOU ARE ASKING: DID WE HAVE THE UNDERSTANDING THAT

SMITH WOULD ENTERTAIN NO OTHER PROPOSALS, FOR VARIATIONS ON THAT, OR FOR A DIFFERENT KIND OF STRUCTURE WHICH WOULD EQUALLY PRESERVE --

Q: NO, I AM ASKING YOU SOMETHING DIFFERENT.

WHEN HE MADE HIS ANNOUNCEMENT, HE SAID HE WAS

ACCEPTING A PACKAGE DEAL. AND HE SAID THE PACKAGE CONSISTS OF -- AND THEN HE WENT THROUGH THIS THING IN SOME DETAIL.

NOW, WHAT I AM TRYING TO FIND OUT IS: NOW THAT THE AFRICANS SAY THEY WANT TO GO OVER THE DETAILS OF THE SPECIFICS, IS HE IN A POSITION TO SAY "IT IS NO DEAL, BECAUSE I THOUGHT I BOUGHT A PACKAGE AND NOW I FIND OUT I HAVEN'T BOUGHT A PACKAGE AT ALL, I HAVE JUST BOUGHT SOME PREMISES?"

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 15 STATE 240517

A: THE PLACE TO SETTLE THAT IS AT THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES --

Q: ON THAT BASIS, HAS HE AGREED TO GO TO THE MEETING ON THAT BASIS?

A: WE HAVE NOT BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THEM ON THAT MATTER.

Q: SO YOU DON'T KNOW THAT.

A: WE DON'T KNOW THAT HE WILL GO TO THE MEETING ON THAT BASIS. BUT, AS I SAY, THE BASIC STRUCTURE IS PRECISELY THE SAME ON BOTH SIDES. THEY HAVE ACCEPTED THE IDEA OF MAJORITY RULE, WHICH IS THE ULTIMATE PRIZE THAT ALL HAVE BEEN STRUGGLING FOR ON THE AFRICAN SIDE. THEY HAVE ACCEPTED THE IDEA THAT THERE WILL BE AN INTERIM GOVERNMENT. THEY HAVE ACCEPTED THE IDEA OF AN ORGANIZING MEETING FOR THAT INTERIM GOVERNMENT.

Q: BILL, CAN I GO BACK TO A MORE BASIC POINT?

IF WORDS MEAN ANYTHING, I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THESE WORDS CAN BE RECONCILED WITH WHAT YOU HAVE JUST SAID. THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS SAID, "THESE PROPOSALS, IF ACCEPTED, WOULD BE TANTAMOUNT TO LEGALIZING THE COLONIALIST AND RACIST STRUCTURE OF POWER."

NOW, ARE THEY JUST SAYING THAT FOR TACTICAL REASONS, OR WHAT? BECAUSE IF WORDS MEAN ANYTHING, IT WOULD SEEM THAT THEY WANT TO RENEGOTIATE THE WHOLE PACKAGE.

A: THE WHOLE PACKAGE? NO, NO. OBVIOUSLY NOT THE WHOLE PACKAGE, BECAUSE THEY HAVE AGREED TO HAVE THE ORGANIZING MEETING.

Q: WHAT DO YOU THINK THEIR PURPOSE IS, THEN, IN DESCRIBING WHAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO THEM AS COLONIALIST AND RACIST?

A: I THINK THERE ARE A COUPLE THINGS ABOUT THAT. NUMBER ONE, IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THEY HAVE THEIR OWN INTERESTS -- UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 16 STATE 240517

DOMESTIC INTERESTS -- IN TERMS OF THE RHETORIC THEY USE.

THE SECOND POINT IS THAT THEY ARE OBVIOUSLY LEGITIMATELY CONCERNED THAT THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, IN FACT, REPRESENTS A MAJOR ADVANCE TOWARD MAJORITY RULE, AND NOT THE RE-EMERGENCE OF A STRUCTURE OF POWER, THE OLD STRUCTURE OF POWER IN A NEW GUISE.

Q: CAN I READ SOME POINTS FROM SMITH'S SPEECH? HE SAID -- "I SHALL NOW READ THE ACTUAL TERMS OF THE PROPOSAL PUT TO ME BY DR. KISSINGER." POINT THREE, WHICH WE WERE TOLD HAD BEEN APPROVED OF BY BOTH SIDES, THEN DETAILS THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, "... SHOULD CONSIST OF A COUNCIL OF STATE, HALF OF WHOSE MEMBERS," ETC., "WITH A COUNCIL OF MINISTERS," ETC. I MEAN, IT IS A LONG POINT. POINT THREE IS SPELLED OUT IN DETAIL.

AND WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO FIND OUT IS, HAD BOTH SMITH AND THE BLACK AFRICAN PRESIDENTS GIVEN THEIR APPROVAL OF THIS FORMULA BY THE TIME SECRETARY KISSINGER LEFT DAR ES SALAAM?

A: HAD THEY GIVEN THEIR APPROVAL TO THAT?

Q: YES.

A: NO. WE PRESENTED IT TO THEM. THEY INDICATED THEIR GENERAL CONCURRENCE WITH THE PLAN, WITH THE TOTALITY OF THE FIVE POINTS. OBVIOUSLY THEY HAD TO GET TOGETHER.

Q: BUT OBVIOUSLY THEY HAVE CHANGED THEIR MINDS.

A: THEY COULD NOT SPEAK FOR THE OTHER PRESIDENTS. THEY DID INDICATE THEIR GENERAL APPROVAL OF THE TOTAL OVERALL STRUCTURE AND SEQUENCE. AND THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE CONTINUING TO DO. BUT THEY SAY THERE ARE MAJOR DETAILS WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT AT THE ORGANIZING MEETING.

Q: SMITH ACCEPTED IT. HE SAID, "HERE IS THE SPECIFIC THING I HAVE BEEN GIVEN." NOW HE DISCOVERS THAT POINT THREE IS NOT SOMETHING WHICH IS VALID AND WAS OFFERED TO UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 17 STATE 240517

HIM.

NOW, WHERE DOES THIS LEAVE SMITH?

A: ARE YOU SUGGESTING YOU WANT TO GIVE HIM AN "OUT" FOR THE --

Q: I AM NOT TRYING TO GIVE HIM AN OUT, AT ALL. I THINK IT'S A GREAT IDEA IF WE CAN BRING PEACE IN SOUTHERN AFRICA.

BUT I AM ASKING YOU WHAT HAPPENS TO A MAN WHO IS GIVEN A PACKAGE BY DR. KISSINGER AND SUDDENLY HE IS TOLD THAT THE PACKAGE IS NO GOOD.

A: WELL, HIS FIRST STATEMENT, WHICH I COMMEND TO YOUR ATTENTION, WAS A VERY BALANCED STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE LUSAKA --

Q: MR. ROGERS, CAN YOU TELL ME ONE OTHER POINT AND THAT IS:

DID YOU SOLICIT THESE MESSAGES, NOW THAT YOU SAY YOU HAVE JUST GOTTEN --

A: NO.

Q: -- THIS LUSAKA STATEMENT?

A: NO. ABSOLUTELY NOT.

Q: DOES THE SECRETARY --

Q: I BELIEVE THAT MR. SMITH IS QUOTED AS HAVING AGREED TO THE TURNOVER ON CERTAIN CONDITIONS, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, TWO OF WHOM ARE:
FIRST, CONSTITUTIONAL MEETINGS IN RHODESIA, BY RHODESIANS.

SECONDLY, THAT THE TERRORIST INCURSIONS COME TO AN END.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 18 STATE 240517

AND MY QUESTION IS THIS: SINCE THE BLACK AFRICAN PRESIDENTS HAVE REPORTEDLY BEEN ALLOWED TO CONTINUE THE TERRORISM -- "STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION" AS THEY CALL IT -- AND THERE ARE ALREADY REPORTED PLANS TO TRY AND HOLD THE MEETING OUTSIDE RHODESIA, ISN'T THIS REALLY, WHEN YOU

GET RIGHT DOWN TO IT, THE END OF THIS ALLEGED "BREAK-THROUGH?"

A: NO.

Q: IT'S NOT?

WHY? COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHY IT IS NOT THE END?

THESE PEOPLE DON'T ACCEPT IT. THE PRESIDENTS DON'T, APPARENTLY, ACCEPT THE DETAILS AS THIS HAS JUST BEEN READ.

AND SMITH CERTAINLY DOESN'T, BECAUSE THESE INCURSIONS HAVE NOT ENDED -- AND SO FORTH.

AND I WONDERED WHY YOU THINK THAT THERE IS VERY MUCH LEFT.

A: THERE IS A NATURAL TEMPTATION HERE TO TRY TO, WITH A MICROSCOPE, FIND DIFFERENCES OF ANNOUNCED PUBLIC POSITIONS BETWEEN THE PARTIES.

WHAT I AM TRYING TO EMPHASIZE TO YOU IS THAT THE REITERATION AND THE CONSTANT EXAMINATION OF WORDS THAT CLOSELY, IN A PROCESS WHICH IS AN EVOLVING ONE, AS TO WHICH THE BASIC SEQUENCE HAS BEEN AGREED TO BY BOTH SIDES IS NOT AN ACCURATE STATEMENT OF, IN OUR JUDGMENT, THE PROSPECTS FOR EVENTUAL RESOLUTION THROUGH NEGOTIATION --

Q: THERE IS A CENTRAL, VERY SIMPLE, ISSUE HERE AND IT DOESN'T HAVE TO DO WITH SEMANTICS OR WORDS. IT HAS TO DO WITH WHETHER DETAILS OF THE PLAN WERE PRESENTED TO SMITH BY SECRETARY KISSINGER WITH THE STATEMENT THAT THESE HAD BEEN ACCEPTED IN ADVANCE BY THE AFRICAN LEADERS. AND THAT ON THAT BASIS, THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE TO BEGIN.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 19 STATE 240517

THAT WAS, I BELIEVE, OUR UNDERSTANDING.

A: NO, NO.

WHAT WE MADE VERY CLEAR WAS THAT WE HAD BEEN IN EXTENSIVE CONSULTATIONS WITH THE BRITISH, THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED AT CONSIDERABLE LENGTH THE BASIC IDEAS.

WE DID NOT SAY THAT EACH AND EVERY WORD OF THE PROPOSALS HAD BEEN CLEARED BEFOREHAND WITH THE AFRICANS.

Q: BUT WAS THAT CLEAR TO SMITH?

A: YES.

HE THEN TOOK THE FIVE POINTS THAT WE HAVE PROVIDED HIM, EMBRACED THOSE, AND PUT THEM ON THE TABLE AS HIS POSITION.

Q: BILL, --

Q: NO, CAN I PICK UP A POINT HERE? PLEASE.

YOU SAID EARLIER -- THIS IS FOR CLARIFICATION -- YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER SMITH WILL GO TO THIS MEETING ON THE BASIS OF THE BLACK AFRICAN CHALLENGE.

IS THAT --

A: WE HAVE HEARD NOTHING FROM SMITH SINCE THE LUSAKA STATEMENT WAS MADE, OTHER THAN WHAT HE HAS SAID PUBLICLY. SO I CANNOT STAND UP HERE AND SAY: "YES, WE KNOW THAT SMITH WILL GO."

Q: BUT AS FOR THE ISSUE OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE STRUGGLE -- THE CENTRAL ISSUE TO THE WHOLE CONFIRMATION OF THE PROCESS -- I MEAN -- DOESN'T THERE SEEM TO BE A FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SMITH POSITION SAYING "WE WILL PUT UP THIS CONDITIONAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDED THAT THE FIGHTING CEASES" AND THE POSITION OF THE AFRICAN LEADERS THAT SAY THE FIGHTING IS GOING ON?
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 20 STATE 240517

A: I AM NOT SURE -- WHAT IS YOUR POINT? THAT THE PARTIES MAY SPLIT APART IN TERMS OF THE DATE ON WHICH THE GUERRILLA WARFARE ACTIVITIES STOP?

Q: WELL, YOU KNOW --

A: I SAY AGAIN: THIS IS A PROCESS.

THERE IS GOING TO HAVE TO BE CONCILIATION AND COMPROMISE ON BOTH SIDES, ALL THE WAY THROUGH, TO THE FINAL DAY WHEN THAT CONSTITUTION IS IN EFFECT.

THERE ARE A THOUSAND REASONS WHY THE PARTIES MAY FALL APART. WE HAVE EMPHASIZED THAT FROM THE BEGINNING.

Q: WHAT IS THAT?

A: THAT THE PARTIES MAY NOT BE ABLE TO GET TOGETHER.

WHAT WE HAVE EMPHASIZED, HOWEVER, IS THAT WHAT HAS NOW BEGUN IS A PROCESS. WE ARE NOT REPRESENTING TO ANY-BODY THAT THE PROCESS IS GOING EVENTUALLY, IN THE END, TO SUCCEED -- BECAUSE AS I SAY, IT IS GOING TO REQUIRE MAJOR ADJUSTMENTS BY BOTH SIDES TO GET THROUGH THIS HIGHLY COMPLEX PROCESS OF ORGANIZING THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT AND SETTLING ON THE CONSTITUTION.

NOW ALL WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO -- BUT IT SEEMS TO US A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION -- IS TO START THE PROCESS GOING.

THE PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO MEET.

ONE SAYS: "WE DON'T ACCEPT WHAT THE OTHER FELLOW SAID ABOUT THE STRUCTURE OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, WE COME WITH NO PRECONDITIONS."

BOTH HAVE AGREED TO MEET TO DECIDE ON HOW THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT OUGHT TO OPERATE. IT IS THE PROCESS THAT HAS NOW BEGUN.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 21 STATE 240517

Q: BILL, COULD I --

A: BUT A WARRANT THAT IT IS GOING TO SUCCEED?

WE HAVE NEVER PUT ONE ON THE TABLE AND WE ARE NOT IN A POSITION TO MAKE ONE.

Q: DID THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS EXPLAIN TO YOU WHAT THEY MEANT BY -- THAT THEY COULD NOT ACCEPT PRACTICES THAT KEEP THE EXISTING RACE REGIME GOING? DID THEY SPELL OUT WHAT THAT OBJECTION WAS?

A: NO. THEY SAID THEY HAD SOME QUESTIONS, SERIOUS QUESTIONS, ABOUT INSURING THAT THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT, AS I SAID BEFORE, NOT REPRESENT A CONTINUATION IN A NEW GUISE OF THE OLD STRUCTURE OF POWER; THAT IT REALLY REPRESENTS A MAJOR BREAK WITH THE PAST AND, IN FACT, BE A STAGE

WHICH WILL LEAD EFFECTIVELY TO A JUST MAJORITY RULE SYSTEM WITHIN THE TWO-YEAR PERIOD.

Q: COULD I JUST CLEAR UP ONE POINT?

Q: THAT IS THEIR LANGUAGE TO YOU, OR HAVE YOU SAID IT BEFORE?

Q: WAS THAT THEIR LANGUAGE?

A: IT'S A FAIR SUMMARY OF THEIR LANGUAGE, YES.

Q: COULD I CLEAR UP ONE POINT? THERE ARE SEVERAL PEOPLE WHO HAVE USED THE PHRASE "TWO YEARS."

A "WITHIN TWO YEARS."

Q: TWO YEARS FROM WHAT DAY? FROM FRIDAY, OR FROM WHEN THE CONFERENCE BEGINS?

A: WE HAVEN'T BEEN QUITE THAT SPECIFIC ABOUT THE POINT, QUITE FRANKLY. THIS IS ANOTHER ISSUE THAT -- I DON'T MEAN TO DEMEAN IT, BECAUSE IT IS IMPORTANT.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 22 STATE 240517

BUT IT WOULD, IN OUR JUDGMENT, COME WITHIN THE SETS OF DETAIL THAT HAVE TO BE SETTLED AT THIS ORGANIZING MEETING.

Q: MR. ROGERS, ONE LAST QUESTION, IF I MAY:

IF THE SUPPORTERS OF ZANU AND ZAPU, AFTER A MAJORITY GOVERNMENT COMES IN, ESCALATE THEIR LONGSTANDING HOSTILITY AND TRIBAL DIFFERENCES INTO A CIVIL WAR, ARE THE BRITISH AND THE UNITED STATES PREPARED TO PROVIDE ANY PEACE-KEEPING FORCES OR NOT?

A: WE HAVE NOT DETERMINED WHAT OUR POSITION WOULD BE IN THE EVENT THAT THE PEACE EFFORT FAILS AND CIVIL WAR BREAKS OUT IN RHODESIA.

Q: COULD I JUST CLARIFY THAT POINT 3 AGAIN?

EITHER THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS HAD TO CHANGE THEIR POSITION, OR POINT 3 CAME OUT OF SOME CONSULTATIONS THAT THEY WERE NOT INVOLVED IN.

I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THEY CAN REJECT POINT 3 AT THEIR LUSAKA CONFERENCE, HAVING CONCURRED IN IT ON THE WAY IN AND ON THE WAY OUT.

A: NO. WHAT I SAID, DICK, EARLIER, WAS:

THE WORDS IN THE FIVE POINTS WE DID NOT HAVE WHEN WE WENT DOWN TO PRETORIA.

WE DID HAVE THEM WHEN WE CAME BACK, AND WE GAVE

THAT TO THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS.

WE DID RECEIVE FROM THEN AN AFFIRMATIVE AGREEMENT TO THE TOTAL PROCESS.

BUT WE ARE NOT ACCUSING ANYBODY OF RENEGING WITH RESPECT TO A COMMITMENT AS TO THE PRECISE WORDS --

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 23 STATE 240517

Q: IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE WHETHER YOU ACCUSE OR NOT. I AM TRYING TO GET A STATEMENT OF WHAT HAPPENED. PROPOSAL 3 CAME OUT OF VERY CLOSE CONSULTATIONS WITH THE BRITISH -- AMONG THE BRITISH, THE AMERICANS AND THE FRONT-LINE PRESIDENTS -- AND NONE OF THE DETAILS IN THERE COULD HAVE BEEN A SURPRISE TO THE FRONT-LINE PRESIDENTS --

A: NOT, IT WAS NOT.

Q: AND IT WOULD HAVE BEEN LESS OF A SURPRISE WHEN YOU CAME BACK OUT AND CONSULTED IN LUSAKA AND DAR ES SALAAM

A: YES.

Q: AND WE WERE TOLD, ON THE WAY BACK -- THE UNDERSTANDING WAS: "DON'T LOOK AT THE REST OF SMITH'S SPEECH. LOOK AT THE LAST FIVE POINTS, PLUS POINT SIX" WHICH APPARENTLY IS THE PACKAGE.

NOW, SUDDENLY, THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS ARE SAYING: "POINT 3 IS NO GOOD."

OBTAININGLY, THEY HAD TO CHANGE THEIR POSITION -- WHETHER YOU ACCUSE THEM OF IT OR NOT.

A: I DON'T KNOW THAT THEY SAY THAT POINT 3 ISN'T ANY GOOD. I WOULDN'T INTERPRET IT IN THAT PRECISE DETAIL.

WHAT THEY SAY IS: "WE DON'T WANT TO ACCEPT NOW, BEFORE WE GET TO THE CONFERENCE, THE DETAILS THAT SMITH HAS SET FORWARD WITH RESPECT TO THE STRUCTURE OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT."

THEY ARE NOT REJECTING, IN OUR VIEW, THE TOTALITY OF POINT 3.

Q: YOU SEEM TO BE IMPLYING THAT ON YOUR RETURN TRIP WHEN YOU SAW TWO OF THE FRONT-LINE PRESIDENTS THAT THEY RAISED NO SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AT THAT TIME TO POINT 3.

IS THAT CORRECT?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 24 STATE 240517

A: THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT.

Q: IS IT THEN --

A: IT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT THAT WE GAVE THEM, OR READ TO THEM, THE PRECISE LANGUAGE OF THE FIVE PROPOSALS -- AND THEY DID NOT RAISE OBJECTIONS TO THE LANGUAGE AT THAT TIME.

Q: WOULD IT THEN BE YOUR IMPRESSION THAT THEY LATER HAD SECOND THOUGHTS THEMSELVES?

OR PERHAPS THAT THE OTHER PRESIDENTS WHO CAME IN -- THE ANGOLAN AND MOZAMBIQUE REPRESENTATIVES -- TOOK A DIFFERENT VIEW AND SWUNG THE WHOLE GROUP TO -- AWAY FROM POINT 3?

A: NO, NO, LET ME GO BACK AND EMPHASIZE WHAT THEY HAVE SAID TO US -- AND WHAT IS, IT SEEMS TO ME, A FAIR READING OF THEIR STATEMENT:

THEY HAVE NOT REJECTED THE OVERALL PLAN.

THEY HAVE NOT REJECTED THE OVERALL PROCESS. THEY HAVE ACCEPTED THE OVERALL PROCESS.

THEY COME TO THE ORGANIZING CONFERENCE WITH NO PRECONDITIONS, AND THEY WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE DETAILS OF STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF THE INTERIM GOVERNMENT AT THE ORGANIZING CONFERENCE.

Q: BUT IT'S A MATTER OF INTERPRETATION.

Q: WHAT ASSURANCE DO YOU HAVE THAT SMITH IS GOING TO GO TO THE CONFERENCE? WHAT HAPPENS IF SMITH DOESN'T GO TO THE CONFERENCE?

A: I TOLD YOU WE DON'T HAVE ANY ASSURANCE.

I TOLD YOU THAT THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY -- AT EVERY STAGE OF THIS, AT EVERY TURN OF THIS MATTER -- THAT THE

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 25 STATE 240517

PROCESS MAY STOP.

WE HAVE BEGUN THE PROCESS. THAT IS ALL WE CAN SAY TO YOU.

THE OTHER THING WE CAN SAY TO YOU IS: DON'T OVER-STATE THE LUSAKA STATEMENT, AND COMPARE IT WITH THE SMITH STATEMENT AS INDICATING THAT THE PROCESS HAS COME TO AN END --

WHICH IS THINK IS A FAIR INTERPRETATION OF SOME OF THE REPORTING THAT CAME OUT OF THE --

Q: ARE YOU, SIMILARLY, CALLING ON SMITH TO GO TO THIS MEETING WITHOUT PRECONDITIONS?

A: NO. WE HAVE NOT COMMUNICATED WITH SMITH ABOUT THIS YET.

Q: WELL, IS THAT YOUR VIEW, THAT HE SHOULD GO ON THE BASIS OF WHAT THE AFRICANS HAVE ACCEPTED -- WHICH IS THE PROCESS, AND NOT THE DETAILS.

A: WE HAVE NOT SENT A MESSAGE TO HIM AND I DON'T WANT TO USE THIS PRESS CONFERENCE FOR THAT PURPOSE.

Q: THE TRIPARTITE CONFERENCE WHICH IS SUPPOSED TO TAKE PLACE TOMORROW WITH THE SOUTH AFRICANS AND THE BRITISH -- IS IT STILL ON?

A: THE TRIPARTITE MEETINGS WILL GO FORWARD.

Q: BECAUSE WE HEARD FROM PRETORIA THAT THE SOUTH AFRICAN REPRESENTATIVE WAS NOT COMING.

A: NO, NO, MR. FOURIE. THEY HAD ENGINE TROUBLE ON THE AIRPLANE, WHICH BEGAN IT.

AND THEN THE PRIME MINISTER HAS REQUESTED MR. FOURIE TO STAY IN PRETORIA -- BUT MR. BOTHA, THE AMBASSADOR, UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 26 STATE 240517

WILL BE HERE, AND IS AUTHORIZED TO SPEAK FOR SOUTH AFRICA IN THE TRIPARTITE MEETINGS, WHICH WILL GO FORWARD.

Q: SIR ANTHONY DUFF IS NOT COMING HERE EITHER.

A: I THINK HE IS GOING WITH ROWLANDS.

Q: CAN YOU SAY WHAT THE PURPOSE IS OF THE SECRETARY'S
MEETING THIS AFTERNOON WITH BOTHA AND THE FOREIGN MINISTER
OF TANZANIA?

A: I CANNOT CHARACTERIZE THAT. MAYBE BOB CAN.

Q: THANK YOU. KISSINGER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: POLITICAL SETTLEMENT, INTERIM GOVERNMENT, PRESS CONFERENCES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 SEP 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE240517
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: GGAY:MR
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760365-0024
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760911/aaaaajkj.tel
Line Count: 1202
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN AF
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 22
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 MAY 2004 by MaustMC>; APPROVED <22 DEC 2004 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SEPTEMBER 27 PRESS BRIEFING FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS FROM SPOKESMAN ROBERT FUNSETH'S SEPTEMBER 27 PRESS BRIEFING IN WHICH UNDERSECRETAR
TAGS: PFOR, XJ, RH, US, (FUNSETH, ROBERT), (ROGERS, WILLIAM D)
To: AF POSTS
TOKYO
MULTIPLE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

